United Nations A/C.3/59/SR.45

General Assembly
Fifty-ninth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
6 January 2005

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 45th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 17 November 2004, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Kuchinsky ..... (Ukraine)
Later: Ms. Astanah Banu (Vice-Chairman) ..... (Malaysia)

Contents

Agenda item 93: Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (*continued*)

Agenda item 96: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

Agenda item 105: Human rights questions (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

Agenda item 98: Advancement of women (*continued*)

Agenda item 100: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 104: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

04-61215 (E)

0461215

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

Agenda item 93: Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (*continued*)

Draft resolution on the implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (A/C.3/59/L.17/Rev.1)

1. **The Chairman** informed the Committee that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Rehren** (Chile) said that, after consultations, consensus had been reached on draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.17/Rev.1. He announced that Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Brazil, Canada, Cape Verde, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, South Africa, Sudan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine and Uruguay had joined the sponsors.

3. **Mr. Kadiri** (Morocco) said that the adoption of the draft resolution, just before the forthcoming session of the Commission on Social Development and the tenth anniversary of the World Summit for Social Development, would provide clear vision and recommendations to the Commission.

4. **The Chairman** said that the following delegations also wished to join the sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

5. *Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.17/Rev.1 was adopted.*

6. **Mr. Fox** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that, while his delegation had joined the consensus, it had strong reservations about paragraph 10 of the draft resolution. That paragraph inadequately described the means by which Governments should respond to globalization in order to benefit their citizens. Globalization did present nations and Governments with challenges, but its rewards had been demonstrated too often to be ignored. Many developing countries had unprecedented opportunities for growth largely as a result of freer trade, capital flows and movement of people brought about by globalization. It was a force that nations, developing and developed alike, must embrace if they hoped to deliver a better life for their people. To do so required appropriate policy responses, starting with good governance, sound macro-economic policies and a commitment to compete in the world. Governments attempting to turn their back on the process were only limiting the potential for the social development of their people. Lastly, he pointed out that the Second Committee was addressing the issues raised in paragraph 10 in greater detail, and thus, its inclusion was premature.

7. **Mr. Ndimeni** (South Africa) said that his country was the current Chair of the Commission on Social Development, and it expected the draft resolution just adopted to provide the basis for the outcome of its forthcoming session and for the ten-year review of the Copenhagen Summit.

Agenda item 96: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

8. **The Chairman** suggested that the Committee should take note of the following reports under agenda item 96: the report of the Secretary-General on preparations for the Eleventh United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (A/59/123-E/2004/90); the report of the Secretary-General on strengthening international cooperation and technical

assistance in prevention and combating terrorism (A/59/187); the report of the Secretary-General on preventing and combating corrupt practices and transfer of funds of illicit origin and returning such assets to the countries of origin (A/59/203 and Add.1); the report of the Secretary-General on international cooperation in the fight against transnational organized crime (A/59/204); and the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the High-level Political Conference for the Purpose of Signing the United Nations Convention against Corruption (A/59/77).

9. *It was so decided.*

10. **Mr. Fox** (United States of America) said that it was his delegation's understanding that the Committee was taking note of the reports consistent with General Assembly decision 55/488.

Agenda item 105: Human rights questions (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

Draft resolution on human rights and extreme poverty (A/C.3/59/L.38)

11. **Ms. Tincopa Grados** (Peru) introduced the draft resolution and announced that the following delegations had become sponsors: Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bolivia, Brazil, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, the Niger, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, Thailand, Ukraine, Uruguay and Venezuela.

12. The eradication of extreme poverty was a major challenge, particularly for developing countries, and was therefore at the heart of commitments made in the Millennium Declaration and at other international summits. The draft resolution reaffirmed, as had previous resolutions, that extreme poverty and exclusion from society constituted a violation of human dignity. The eradication of extreme poverty required, inter alia, coordinated and continued policies through decisive national action and international cooperation, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including new financial mechanisms to support developing countries, and innovative sources of finance to combat hunger and poverty. She hoped that, as in previous years, the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

13. **The Chairman** announced that Bangladesh, Guinea, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nigeria, Timor-Leste and Viet Nam wished to become sponsors.

Draft resolution on the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism (A/C.3/59/L.44)

14. **Mr. Berruga Filloy** (Mexico) introduced the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, which had been joined by Croatia, Ecuador, Monaco, New Zealand, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine. While the sponsors agreed that terrorism was a serious problem for territorial integrity and the security of States, the imperative need of States to protect their populations against acts that threatened their security, including terrorism, did not justify the permanent derogation or suspension of the human rights of people under their jurisdiction. To the contrary, far from being an obstacle, respect for human rights was an effective tool in countering terrorism and must therefore be a key component of all measures adopted in that regard. Human rights violations were counter-productive as they undermined the objective pursued, which was to guarantee people's security.

15. The draft resolution reaffirmed the international community's duty to enhance cooperation to prevent and combat terrorism, while recalling the obligation of Member States to ensure that any measures taken to combat terrorism complied with all their obligations under international law. The sponsors welcomed the Secretary-General's report on protecting human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism (A/59/404), submitted pursuant to resolution 58/187, and recognized that the United Nations had made progress on the subject. However, the international community needed to continue to strive to guarantee full respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in countering terrorism.

16. The sponsors also welcomed efforts made by States, special human rights mechanisms and procedures, and United Nations human rights treaty bodies in that regard. However, they wished to draw the Committee's attention to the conclusions of the

study of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights that the United Nations had been unable to address the compatibility of national counter-terrorism measures with international human rights obligations in a comprehensive way. They therefore welcomed the appointment of an independent expert on the subject. Lastly, he hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

17. **The Chairman** announced that Bulgaria, Iceland, Madagascar, Malawi and Romania wished to become sponsors.

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

Draft resolution on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran (A/C.3/59/L.50*)

18. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications and that Liechtenstein, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Tuvalu had joined the sponsors.

19. **Mr. Rock** (Canada), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, and announcing Albania, Bulgaria and Palau had joined the sponsors, said that, at the previous session, General Assembly resolution 58/195 had addressed the situation and had requested that it should be revisited at the current session. Regrettably, a deterioration in the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran had been observed. There had been positive developments as well, which had been referred to in the draft resolution in order to present a balanced text, but the progress did not outweigh the serious abuses taking place, and there had been little progress in implementation of that country's commitments in the area of human rights.

20. He understood the reluctance expressed by many delegations regarding country-specific resolutions, yet if international norms were to have meaning, the international community must speak out in compelling cases where those norms had not been respected. Dialogue on human rights was highly important, and a resolution could be a complement to such a dialogue. In fact, many States involved in dialogue with the Islamic Republic of Iran were sponsors of the draft resolution. Through adoption of the draft resolution, the sponsors hoped to achieve change in the everyday lives of the people of that country, including individuals denied the right to speak out, members of minorities and women.

21. **Mr. Hayee** (Pakistan), speaking at the request of the Chairman of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), said that OIC had consistently opposed the presentation of resolutions that were critical of some developing and Islamic countries. Such proposals turned the work of the Committee into a politically motivated exercise and did not advance the cause of human rights. The adoption of the draft resolution would in no way improve the human rights situation in Iran; on the contrary, it would generate confrontation by creating a gulf between the developing and developed countries that was the direct opposite of the agenda of the United Nations.

22. The Islamic Republic of Iran had extended an open invitation to all special rapporteurs to visit the country in discharging their mandates. The human rights dialogue between the European Union and that country was ongoing. The elected Government had taken several positive measures at the executive and legislative levels to ensure progress, and the judiciary was working actively to eliminate human rights violations. Many countries, including developed countries, faced complex obstacles on the path to the achievement of human rights, and a perfectionist approach would be counterproductive. Thus, the members of OIC opposed the draft resolution.

23. **The Chairman** said that a roll-call vote had been requested on the draft resolution.

24. **Ms. Astanah Banu** (Malaysia) speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that, at its thirteenth Summit and its fourteenth Ministerial Conference, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries had emphasized that human rights issues must be addressed in the global context through a constructive, dialogue-based approach, with objectivity, respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, impartiality, non-selectivity and transparency as the guiding principles, taking into account the political, historical, social, religious and cultural characteristics of each country. Exploitation of human rights for political purposes, including targeting of individual countries for extraneous consideration, was contrary to the Charter of the United Nations. Therefore, Malaysia would vote against the draft resolution.

25. **Mr. Cumberbatch** (Cuba) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution, which was discriminatory and reflected, not a genuine interest in promoting the cause of human rights, but rather the double standards with which that cause was handled at the United Nations. The sponsors had no right to monitor the internal affairs of a sovereign State such as the Islamic Republic of Iran. They should instead consider their own human rights problems and seek to promote international human rights and the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

26. **Mr. Meyer** (Brazil) said that his delegation would abstain from the vote on the draft resolution. As his delegation had already stated to the Commission on Human Rights, it very much doubted the wisdom of country-specific resolutions, except with respect to situations of exceptional gravity. Such resolutions served to politicize the issues and did not directly benefit the people whose rights they sought to protect. Brazil had therefore proposed to the Commission on Human Rights a mechanism that considered a global report on the human rights situation all over the world. It also supported the strengthening of thematic procedures. Noting that the draft resolution welcomed the progress made in many areas of human rights, he said that his delegation nevertheless deplored the situation of minorities in Iran, especially the Baha'i, who suffered unjustified discrimination, and whose cultural heritage was being destroyed. He urged Iran to reverse its policy and address the needs of all minorities in accordance with good human rights practices.

27. **Ms. García-Matos** (Venezuela) said that her delegation would vote against the draft resolution as it opposed the selective condemnation of individual States. The use of human rights issues in contravention of States' right of self-determination was a very grave matter.

28. **Ms. Li** Xiaomei (China) said that her delegation would vote against the draft resolution, which ignored the positive progress made by the Islamic Republic of Iran in the area of human rights. China had always affirmed that differences in the sphere of human rights should be resolved through dialogue and exchange. The introduction of country-specific resolutions served only to poison further the atmosphere of confrontation in the Committee, and was not conducive to the healthy promotion of human rights.

29. **Ms. Ataeva** (Turkmenistan) said that the situation of human rights should be considered through dialogue, within the context of each country's specific historical and cultural characteristics. Country-specific resolutions were selective in nature and sought to exploit human rights issues with a view to making political statements.

30. **Ms. Ahmed** (Sudan) said that her delegation would vote against the draft resolution, and wished to reiterate its position of principle against the politicization of human rights issues. The draft resolution represented interference in the internal affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran, a State that promoted dialogue between nations. Canada had acknowledged in its statement that many Member States did not accept the practice of country-specific resolutions, and she therefore wondered why it continued to take that approach. Moreover, the Third Committee was not a forum for settling personal scores.

31. **Mr. Osmane** (Algeria) said that his delegation endorsed the statement made by the representative of Pakistan, as well as the Ministerial Declaration of the Non-Aligned Movement, as presented by the representative of Malaysia. It would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

32. **Mr. Taranda** (Belarus) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution. Belarus had always spoken against country-specific resolutions, which should not be examined by the Third Committee. The draft resolution before the Committee merely criticized the Islamic Republic of Iran, while ignoring its positive achievements in the protection of human rights. His Government called for international cooperation in the human rights field, based on the principle of mutual respect and equal partnership.

33. **Ms. Hastaie** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, when assessing the impact of the United Nations human rights mechanisms, particularly in the context of country-specific resolutions, the most relevant question to be asked was whether they had improved the human rights situation all over the world. Her country viewed the human rights mechanisms as an appropriate process, which was designed to help achieve the goal of respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms. Sadly, it had failed to achieve that goal, primarily because it had lost credibility and legitimacy. The process was not designed to meet the

needs of local constituencies or advance the political agenda of certain countries. The draft resolution introduced by Canada had never gained the support of a solid majority of Member States, and a large number of States believed that such resolutions undermined the potential of the United Nations system and tended to increase the polarization and politicization of human rights in the United Nations.

34. The draft resolution was driven by the demands of Canada's internal politics and was a deliberate response to the controversy surrounding the unfortunate death of the Iranian journalist Zahra Kazemi. Her Government had launched a full and thorough investigation leading to judicial proceedings. The Iranian courts remained seized of the matter, and Canada should respect her country's legal procedures. Canada had a tendency to bring bilateral judicial cases to the General Assembly with a view to advancing its own political interests. Isolated human rights cases should not be used to submit country-specific resolutions.

35. No country could claim a perfect human rights record, and Canada had a record of violating the rights of indigenous peoples, migrants, minorities and foreigners. For example, Keivan Tabash, an Iranian national, had been killed by a Canadian police officer while unarmed. The police officer had been acquitted following a police investigation, despite the request of the victim's family for a judicial investigation. She therefore wondered whether that case justified the submission of a resolution on the situation of human rights in Canada. Human rights instruments and mechanisms should apply to all countries without discrimination and regardless of political considerations.

36. Her delegation urged the sponsors of the draft resolution to pursue fairness, objectivity and impartiality in their implementation of human rights standards. If they believed that the death of Zahra Kazemi provided just grounds for submitting a resolution on Iran, perhaps they should also consider the gross violations of human rights committed by a number of the draft resolution's main sponsors, such as the abuse of Iraqi detainees at Abu Ghraib and other Iraqi prisons and the treatment of those held incommunicado at the Guantanamo naval base. The report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions (A/59/319) stated that many civilians and non-combatants had been killed as a result of security operations or aerial bombardments by United States and Israeli forces in situations of conflict. Moreover, the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the occupied Palestinian Territories referred, in his report, to gross, egregious and systematic violations of human rights and international humanitarian law. There was also a chronic pattern of xenophobia, Islamophobia and religious intolerance against minorities — especially the Muslim population — in Western countries.

37. Governments must acknowledge that no country was immune to human rights abuses. Like her own Government, they should pursue objective, impartial policies aimed at the genuine promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms. The Islamic Republic of Iran was the only country in the Middle East to have extended an open invitation in connection with all the special procedures of the Commission on Human Rights. Three visits had already taken place and two more were scheduled for February 2005. Her country had also established a structured dialogue process with a number of other countries and interested partners, including the European Union, to facilitate the exchange of ideas and experiences.

38. The practice of introducing resolutions on the Islamic Republic of Iran was not only unfair and unjustified, it was also a disservice to that country's policy of openness and cooperation. It might jeopardize the achievements of that policy, and should be categorically rejected. Indeed, if it continued, it might jeopardize the entire process of bilateral and multilateral cooperation and dialogue initiated by her Government. The draft resolution contained a number of false and unsubstantiated assertions, which her delegation was prepared to refute. Lastly, she reaffirmed her country's commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights, and urged Member States to reject the draft resolution.

39. *At the request of the Islamic Republic of Iran, a vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.50.*

40. *Denmark, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, El Salvador,

Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu.

Against:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Brunei Darussalam, China, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Gambia, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Panama, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Singapore, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia.

41. *Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.50 was adopted by 69 votes to 55, with 51 abstentions.*

42. **Mr. Rehren** (Chile) said his delegation had been prompted to vote in favour of the draft resolution by the persistence of certain situations in the Islamic Republic of Iran which violated international human rights instruments, as well as that country's rejection of requests from various quarters to become a party to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. Chile nevertheless welcomed the open invitation extended to the Commission on Human Rights thematic mechanisms to conduct official visits, and the country's overall cooperation with United Nations bodies. His Government would follow developments in the Islamic Republic of Iran with a view to ensuring implementation of the recommendations made by those mechanisms, in particular those of the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief.

43. **Ms. Al Haj Ali** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that her delegation firmly believed that consideration of the human rights situations in individual countries should be non-political and non-selective. Double standards should not be applied, and there should be no interference in the affairs of those countries. Historic and cultural specificities must also be taken into account. The approach must be impartial and based on cooperation and transparent and constructive dialogue.

44. **Ms. Grollova** (Czech Republic) said that, 15 years ago to the day, she and her fellow students had been beaten on the streets for the non-violent expression of their civic views. That incident had marked the start of the "Velvet Revolution", which had later brought to the Presidency a man whose hopes and energy had for decades been fuelled by the moral support of the international community. Had there been no change, she herself would even now have been unable to work abroad without joining the only political party permitted to exist, to share in the responsibility for her country's development by participating in regular democratic elections, to have access to foreign media or even to travel, which was young people's best opportunity to engage in dialogue between nations and cultures. It was therefore an honour for her to be able, on behalf of her Government, to join with those who cared about the protection of fundamental freedoms and human rights for all.

Agenda item 98: Advancement of women (*continued*) (A/C.3/59/L.27/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on trafficking in women and girls (A/C.3/59/L.27/Rev.1)

45. **Ms. Banzon** (Philippines) introduced the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, joined by Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ghana, Guatemala, Iceland, Kyrgyzstan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Namibia, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Venezuela and Viet Nam.

46. There were many root causes underlying the practice of trafficking in human beings, including discriminatory practices and a lack of recognition of human rights. Out of the more than one million people affected, an estimated 80 per cent were women and girls, and 70 per cent of those were trafficked for the commercial sex industry. It was therefore sad that, although the international community had demonstrated its commitment to combating the problem, the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, could do no more to incorporate the gender perspective than including the phrase "especially women and children", and provided no genuine assurance that all efforts to combat trafficking would incorporate such a perspective. It was that gap the draft resolution aimed to fill.

47. The tenth anniversary of the Fourth World Conference on Women was approaching, and the international community could not afford to diminish the strategic importance of a gender-based approach to global efforts to combat trafficking in persons. Thus, while the draft resolution did not ignore the situation of male victims of trafficking, its principal goal was to embody a gender-based approach and thereby to advance the interests of women.

48. She announced a number of revisions to the draft resolution: in the sixth preambular paragraph, the word "particular" had been inserted before the word "problem"; in the eleventh and twelfth preambular paragraphs, the words "in particular" had been replaced by the word "especially"; in paragraph 4, the words "the particular problem of" had been inserted between the words "encourage" and "trafficking", and the word "such" had been inserted after the word "eliminate"; in paragraph 8, the words "women and children" had been replaced by the word "persons", and the words "taking into account" had been replaced by the word "recognizing"; in paragraph 16, the words "especially women and girls" had been deleted, and, in the fourth line, the words "pay particular attention to the needs of women and girls and" had been inserted after the word "trafficking"; and in paragraph 18, the words "in persons" had been inserted after the word "trafficking".

49. *Ms. Astaiah Banu (Malaysia), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

Agenda item 100: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Draft resolution on the enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (A/C.3/59/L.72)

50. **Ms. Kusorgbor** (Ghana) introduced the draft resolution on behalf of the delegation of Romania and her own delegation. The draft resolution sought the agreement of the General Assembly concerning a proposal to enlarge the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to accommodate the application for membership by Romania and her country, which had outlined their motivating reasons in E/2004/49 and E/2004/76 respectively. Since the Executive Committee's inception, the membership had been enlarged on the basis of applicants being able to demonstrate their interest in and devotion to solving refugee problems, and their acceptance of and respect for the relevant international instruments. From an initial 25 members in 1959, membership now stood at 66, reflecting the broader interest of Member States in the work of UNHCR and the growing challenge of refugee issues. In view of their respective backgrounds, it was her view that the two countries met the membership requirements. Membership would enable them to further the international community's efforts by together addressing the problems of refugees. The two delegations concerned, therefore, hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

51. **The Chairman** announced that Togo wished to sponsor the draft resolution.

Draft resolution on the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (A/C.3/59/L.73)

52. **Mr. Nürnberg** (Norway) introduced the draft resolution on behalf of the Nordic countries and the other sponsors, joined by Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, the Bahamas, Benin, Burundi, Grenada, Guyana, Honduras, Lesotho, Mauritania, Mongolia, the Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sierra Leone and Solomon Islands.

53. The purpose of the draft resolution was to reaffirm the General Assembly's support for the work of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and to allow the Assembly to provide policy directives on essential aspects of that work, while recalling the shared responsibilities of States. The draft resolution clearly focused on new developments, particularly in the area of international protection and durable solutions, and reflected on the work undertaken by UNHCR and the Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme over the previous year. He thanked delegations for their spirit of cooperation during consultations and hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

54. **The Chairman** announced that Haiti wished to sponsor the draft resolution.

Draft resolution on a new international humanitarian order (A/C.3/59/L.74)

55. **Mr. Hyassat** (Jordan) introduced the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors. His Government had been closely associated with promoting the results of various General Assembly resolutions on the subject and was pleased that recommendations made by the General Assembly and the Secretary-General had been implemented. However, in view of the global challenges of recent years, there was a growing and urgent need to further intensify collective efforts to promote an agenda for humanitarian action, as recommended in General Assembly resolution 57/184. In that regard, he drew attention to the report of the Secretary-General on a new international humanitarian order (A/59/554), which put forward a series of recommendations on improving the overall global situation in the humanitarian field. Suggestions made by the delegations during consultations would be reflected in the revised version, which would be finalized soon. He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

56. **The Chairman** announced that Bangladesh wished to become a sponsor.

Draft resolution on assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa (A/C.3/59/L.78)

57. **Ms. Joyce** (South Africa), introduced the draft resolution on behalf of the African Group, as well as the sponsors, which had been joined by Cuba, the Czech Republic, France, Iceland and Spain.

58. African countries remained hosts to thousands of refugees and displaced persons. While a series of important peace initiatives in the previous year had raised the hopes of thousands of refugees of returning to their countries of origin, elsewhere prospects were dim as new emergencies arose. Such events imposed an intolerable burden of human suffering on both refugees and the fragile communities that hosted them, in turn bringing a risk of new conflict and flight.

59. The draft resolution, which had been streamlined considerably, was therefore of great importance, recalling the many efforts being taken at all levels to address the root causes of displacement, calling on the international community to take concrete action to assist African countries in meeting the protection and assistance needs of refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa, as well as highlighting important new developments. The situation of women and children was mentioned in the context of the Secretary-General's recent report entitled "Women and peace and security" (S/2004/814). Another significant addition was the recognition of the need to pay attention to unaccompanied and separated children, particularly former child soldiers, in both refugee settings and repatriation processes.

60. The tragic armed attack in Gatumba transit camp (Burundi) in 2004 had highlighted the pressing need to ensure the security and well-being of refugees and asylum-seekers. The draft resolution outlined many of the complex issues surrounding the problem of refugees and displaced persons in Africa, while also recognizing the importance of recent initiatives and calling for support in their implementation. Lastly, it emphasized the importance of partnership at all levels

and called on the international community generously to fund programmes aimed at protecting and assisting refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa. She therefore hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

61. **The Chairman** announced that Sierra Leone wished to become a sponsor.

Agenda item 104: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

Draft resolution on the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination (A/C.3/59/L.75)

62. **Mr. Khalid** (Pakistan) introduced the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, which had been joined by Algeria. The right to self-determination was a cardinal principle of international law and a key principle and objective of the Charter. As generally understood, the right to freely determine political status and the right to freely pursue economic, social and cultural development were individual and collective rights which had, moreover, been established in a number of international conventions and declarations.

63. The realization of the right to self-determination was a sine qua non for enjoying all other rights and was highly conducive to the promotion of democracy. It had also helped millions of people across the world to free themselves of colonialism, apartheid, foreign occupation and alien domination, resulting in a larger family of independent States at the United Nations. He hoped that the draft resolution, which continued to apply to many situations around the world, would be adopted by consensus.

64. **The Chairman** announced that Jordan wished to become a sponsor.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.